

building that stood up that day and protected our democracy, and we will be forever thankful to them.

We are hearing a lot about gold medals, and some of them by our own USA team that we are so proud of the last week at the Olympics.

This is our Olympics. This is our gold medal. And it goes to them, to the Capitol Police officers and the Metropolitan Police officers and others that protected us that day.

Thanks, Senator BLUNT, who is here with us as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I am proud to join my friend and my colleague Senator KLOBUCHAR as we introduce and support this amendment.

You know, every day when I come to work at the Capitol, the first person I see is almost always a U.S. Capitol Police officer, and no matter how late I leave at night, the last person I see is almost always a U.S. Capitol Police officer.

I was working in this building on 9/11, and one of the last people to leave that morning as the Capitol Police encouraging us to get out of the building, but the last person I saw as I left the building who was still in the building was a Capitol Police officer.

The Capitol Police have a hard job to do. They not only defend us, but they defend democracy in a way that other police officers are not asked to do, and they always do it at the highest level of professionalism and dedication. That was never more evident than it was on January 6. It was a difficult and sad day for Americans but especially for law enforcement officers who serve and protect the Capitol and for their families.

I have often said that, very possibly, the hardest job to do in America today is to be the family member of someone who works in law enforcement. Maybe the second hardest job is to be the person working in law enforcement. But those families on that day were watching television, listening to the news, seeing their very worst fears play out for all the world to see on a day that was horrific for them, horrific for the person they love, and horrific for those who love this building and what it stands for.

I am incredibly grateful for the heroic actions we saw that day from the Capitol Police, from the Metropolitan Police, who, along with Chief Conte, who was the Acting Chief at the time, were here within 10 or 12 minutes of being called and here in force in that period of time.

Others came from around the region, and all those law enforcement people who were here to help that day, we are deeply appreciative of.

The legislation we have here really calls on us to recognize the selflessness, the dedication, the willingness to stand in the way of danger as others are able to try to get away from danger. It honors the sacrifices they make and their families make every day.

I hope, by passing this Congressional Gold Medal bill by unanimous consent, we send a clear message to law enforcement officers that we are united in our appreciation of all they do to keep us safe.

I urge my colleagues to join not only in supporting the unanimous passage of this bill but also to be quick in talking about our deep appreciation for those who serve in such a special way as we try to do our work here every day.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3325.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3325) to award four congressional gold medals to the United States Capitol Police and those who protected the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 3325) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleagues, every single one of them, including Senator BLUNT and Senator COLLINS, who is here with us today, for supporting this legislation and honoring the heroism and patriotism of the courageous law enforcement officers who risk and in some cases sacrifice their lives to defend our democracy. I also want to thank Senator BLUNT for his work on the Senate version of this legislation, as well as Senator SCHUMER and Senator MCCONNELL, and I thank Senator BLUNT for joining me today.

Now it is headed to the President's desk. No more motions, and this is done. I look forward to seeing this bill signed into law.

I yield the floor.

#### INVESTING IN A NEW VISION FOR THE ENVIRONMENT AND SURFACE TRANSPORTATION IN AMERICA ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I would associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues who have just been here acknowledging the heroic work done by the Capitol Police on January 6. Clearly, they are very deserving of all the recognition that they have received.

What they went through on that very harrowing day I think is a reminder to all of us of the importance of the work they do day in and day out and just the challenge they face defending this Capitol and people who work in it. I, like my colleagues, am enormously grateful and just want to join in recognizing that with the award they just received.

I also point out that we are in the midst of a debate here on a bill that was negotiated in a bipartisan way. It is great to see Republicans and Democrats working together, talking together, coming up with solutions, whether we agree with them or not. But the fact that there are people sitting down across the table from each other and working through some of these big issues that we face here, one of which, obviously, in this country is maintaining a strong infrastructure, is encouraging, and in many ways, it is refreshing to see that happening here.

#### NOMINATION OF TRACY STONE-MANNING

Mr. President, it is sort of ironic, too, that in the light of that spirit of bipartisanship, that we continue to see nominees brought to the floor who don't reflect that spirit.

The Senate voted last week to bring Tracy Stone-Manning's nomination to the Senate floor. It is difficult to know exactly what President Biden was thinking when he decided to nominate Ms. Stone-Manning for Director of the Bureau of Land Management. Perhaps the administration's vetting wasn't thorough enough. Otherwise, it is pretty difficult to understand why the President would nominate an individual with ties to an ecoterrorist organization—an ecoterrorist organization—to head the Bureau of Land Management.

That is not all. She was actually involved in a tree-spiking plot during her time in graduate school, sending a threatening letter to the U.S. Forest Service at the request of one of the individuals involved in spiking trees in an Idaho forest.

Tree spiking, as many know, involves hammering spikes into the trunks of trees to cripple chain saws or the equipment at the sawmill where the trees are processed. It poses a significant threat to logging and mill equipment, but most seriously, it poses a threat to human life.

In a famous incident, a worker at a lumber mill in California was engaged in splitting logs when his saw hit a spiked log and the saw exploded. I will let a Washington Post story covering the incident speak for itself, and I quote from the Washington Post, as follows:

He was nearly three feet away when the log hit his saw and the saw exploded. One half of the blade stuck in the log. The other half hit Alexander in the head, tearing through his safety helmet and face shield. His face was slashed from eye to chin. His teeth were smashed and his jaw was cut in half.

Alexander had never even heard of a sabotage tactic called tree spiking until he became a victim of "eco-terrorism." Someone who objected to tree cutting had imbedded a

huge steel spike in the log that violently jammed the saw.

Then the Washington Post continued, and I quote again:

Tree spikes are among the most vicious of the strategies. While the tree is still in the forest, the spike is driven in at an angle so the head is hidden in the bark. It can shatter a chain saw on impact, sending pieces of razor-sharp steel flying.

It is very hard for me to believe that we are seriously considering confirming an individual to head the Bureau of Land Management who was in any way involved with tree spiking.

Furthermore, Ms. Stone-Manning apparently initially refused to cooperate with the subsequent investigation into the tree-spiking incident, only coming clean after it became clear that she could face criminal charges for her role in the incident. Equally troubling is the less-than-forthright response that she provided to the Senate on her nominee questionnaire about whether or not she had ever been investigated by a law enforcement organization.

Ms. Stone-Manning's involvement in the tree-spiking incident is not the only reason to be concerned that she has extremist views. As a graduate student, she also argued for population control, in one instance referring to a child as an "environmental hazard." Last year, she took advantage of Twitter to promote an article her husband wrote in which he expressed satisfaction at the idea of seeing homes people have built in forests burn in fires.

President Obama's first Bureau of Land Management Director withdrew his support for Ms. Stone-Manning's nomination over her involvement in the tree-spiking plot. A Deputy Director at the BLM under President Obama also expressed his concern over the nomination, noting:

Much of the focus seems to be whether this is a Democrat or Republican thing, but the lens I look at this through is as a 38-year career person in both agencies. . . . [Y]ou need the career employees to implement your agenda successfully across the West. Your leader has got to be respected by career employees and across the landscape, in both blue and red states.

His point is well-taken. How are BLM employees and the many Americans who regularly interact with the Bureau of Land Management going to feel about working with Ms. Stone-Manning? Our public lands are used for a variety of purposes, including recreation, livestock grazing, and timber harvesting. What kind of attitude should we expect from Ms. Stone-Manning to display toward timber harvesting? Is this really the best President Biden can do when it comes to the Director of the Bureau of Land Management?

As 75 House Republicans said in a letter to President Biden urging him to withdraw the nomination, "There is no doubt that someone with this history of extreme, violent views should not be in a position of authority at an agency responsible for managing 245 million acres of federal lands and 700 million acres of mineral estate."

I wish I could say that Ms. Stone-Manning's nomination is an aberration, but, in fact, President Biden has nominated a number of candidates with extremist views for various offices.

Last week, we voted on his nominee to head U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, a nominee who failed to receive even a single bipartisan vote in committee, due in part to her refusal to say she won't completely bypass Congress when fashioning policies to deal with those who are in the United States unlawfully.

Then there is the President's nominee for head of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, David Chipman, whose main interest seems to be targeting law-abiding gun owners and who has communicated a clear disdain for gun owners in public remarks. This nominee was also apparently the subject of a complaint for making racist remarks while working at ATF.

Then there are the multiple President Biden nominees now serving in the Department of Justice who have publicly expressed their support for defunding the police. That is right—President Biden filled key posts at the Justice Department, the Department charged with enforcing the law and prosecuting criminals, with individuals who have gone on the record with their support for defunding the police.

I suppose it is no real surprise that President Biden nominated an individual to the Bureau of Land Management who once referred to a child as an "environmental hazard" when you consider who he nominated to head up the Department of Health and Human Services.

HHS Secretary Xavier Becerra's rabidly pro-abortion views put him far to the left of the majority of Americans. Polls consistently show that a strong majority of Americans believe that there should be at least some restrictions on abortion. President Biden's HHS Secretary doesn't seem to support any restriction on abortion, and if he does, I would sure like to hear about them. During his time in the House of Representatives, Secretary Becerra repeatedly voted against banning partial-birth abortion, an abortion procedure so heinous that I think most Americans would rightfully shrink from seeing it performed on an animal, let alone a human being.

As I said, given that, I suppose it is not hard to believe that President Biden nominated an individual to the Bureau of Land Management who once described a child as an "environmental hazard."

President Biden tends to present himself as a moderate and someone who will bring people together. He said in his inaugural address: "I pledge this to you: I will be a President for all Americans." In practice, however, too often he has seemed to be a President for the far-left wing of the Democratic Party.

I hope that my Democratic colleagues will think twice before con-

firmiting Ms. Stone-Manning as head of the Bureau of Land Management. Involvement with ecoterrorism should be a disqualifying factor for heading up this Agency.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

AMENDMENT NO. 2181

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, this amendment is the first step to determine how we invest in our infrastructure moving forward.

Since 2008, we have repeatedly bailed out the highway trust fund. That makes it a trust fund that we cannot actually trust.

A highway cost allocation study provides the data that we need in order to make long-term, sustainable, and fiscally sound decisions about how best to invest in our Nation's aging infrastructure. These studies used to occur regularly, but the last one was completed over 20 years ago.

My amendment would direct the Department of Transportation to carry out a study in 4 years, giving those of us here in Congress a full year to analyze the results before the highway programs expire once again. We can't continue to burden future generations with out-of-control spending, and this amendment is a signal to future Congresses that we must find lasting solutions for infrastructure investment.

I want to thank Senator KELLY and Senator CORNYN for their support in this effort, and I urge the rest of my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, as we work to pass this bipartisan Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to upgrade and modernize our country's infrastructure, I am glad to be here joining Senator LUMMIS to introduce this amendment to include our Highway Cost Allocation Act.

As a former engineer and astronaut, my career has taught me about the importance of having the data to tackle a complex issue.

This bipartisan amendment would require the Secretary of Transportation to conduct the first comprehensive study of vehicle highway usage in nearly 25 years. This information would inform decisions to address the Highway Trust Fund's revenue shortfalls during its next reauthorization cycle.

That is important for growing States, like Arizona and other Western States, and for our entire country, so I urge my colleagues to support our bipartisan amendment.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator CAPITO and I be allowed to speak briefly just before the amendment.

Senator CAPITO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I rise to support this amendment.

This amendment, as we know, would require the Department of Transportation to conduct a highway cost allocation study—the first one since 1997.

Vehicles are different than they were in 1997, and roadway use has increased significantly. This study will help us to analyze the direct cost of highway use by different types of users, and then compare that to user fee revenue contributions to the Highway Trust Fund.

This is about gathering roadway use information to inform decisions to address the Highway Trust Fund shortfalls. I encourage my colleagues to vote yes on the Lummis-Kelly-Cornyn amendment.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I want to join my voice with that of Ranking Member Senator CAPITO and say I rise in support of the amendment offered by Senator LUMMIS, Senator CORNYN, Senator KELLY to direct the U.S. Department of Transportation to conduct a highway user cost allocation study, that we are going to vote on here in just a minute or two.

A cost allocation study helps determine the costs in terms of road use and damage that are attributable to the different types of vehicles that use our roads. This study will evaluate vehicle weights and miles that are traveled in each class to determine the use and damage done to roads, and then compare them to the amount paid in user fees to the Highway Trust Fund.

My colleagues know the Highway Trust Fund has been spending more than it collects for nearly two decades, and as we look to equitably address this growing shortfall, this study will help us better understand the extent to which different roadway users benefit from roads and how they should fairly contribute to the upkeep of those roads, highways, and bridges.

This cost allocation will help Congress ensure that our vehicles pay their fair share. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this very worthy amendment.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendment be called up to the substitute and be reported by number: No. 1, Lee No. 2255, substitute; further, that following the vote on amendment 2181, the Senate vote in relation to the Lee amendment with no amendments in order to the amendment prior to a vote in relation to the amendment, with 60

affirmative votes required for adoption, and 5 minutes for Senator LEE and 1 minute for myself for debate prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2255

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. CARPER], for Mr. LEE, proposes an amendment numbered 2255 to amendment No. 2137.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of August 2, 2021, under "Text of Amendments.")

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CARPER. As a result of this agreement, there will be two rollcall votes at 11:45 a.m. The first vote would be on the Lummis-Kelly amendment No. 2181. The second vote would be on the Lee amendment No. 2255. We continue to work on scheduling additional votes following the caucus lunches.

#### VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2181

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to the Lummis-Kelly amendment No. 2181.

Ms. LUMMIS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 3, as follows:

#### [Rollcall Vote No. 294 Leg.]

#### YEAS—95

Baldwin	Grassley	Portman
Barrasso	Hagerty	Reed
Bennet	Hassan	Risch
Blackburn	Heinrich	Romney
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blunt	Hirono	Rounds
Booker	Hoeven	Rubio
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Sanders
Braun	Johnson	Sasse
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Burr	Kelly	Schumer
Cantwell	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Capito	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shelby
Carper	Lankford	Sinema
Casey	Leahy	Smith
Cassidy	Lujan	Stabenow
Collins	Lummis	Sullivan
Coons	Manchin	Tester
Cornyn	Markey	Thune
Cortez Masto	Marshall	Tillis
Cotton	McConnell	Toomey
Cramer	Menendez	Tuberville
Crapo	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cruz	Moran	Warner
Daines	Murkowski	Warnock
Duckworth	Murphy	Warren
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Ernst	Ossoff	Wicker
Feinstein	Padilla	Wyden
Fischer	Paul	Young
Gillibrand	Peters	

#### NAYS—3

Hawley Lee Scott (FL)

#### NOT VOTING—2

Graham Inhofe

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SINEMA). On this vote, the yeas are 95, the nays are 3.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2181) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2255

Mr. LEE. Madam President, infrastructure is important. We all need it. We rely on it to get to and from our homes, to and from work. We rely on it for our day-to-day needs. It has to be there. Not all of it has to be Federal, and what is Federal can be made more efficient. My amendment today is directed at exactly that set of objectives.

It would finally resolve the fiscal insolvency of the highway trust fund and give Americans a tax cut. It would allow Americans to pay less and Federal, State, and local governments to build more. Pay less, build more—that is the emphasis of this entire amendment. We should pay less for what we need, and we should build more of it.

Specifically, my amendment would transfer \$120 billion in unused COVID-19 funds to the highway trust fund. It returns the scope of the highway trust fund dollars so that they can be used only for projects on the Interstate Highway System. This was, after all, why the gasoline tax was created, and it ought to be what we use it for today. After all, most roads are not interstate, and most systems are not the Interstate Highway System. The Federal Government doesn't need to do all of it.

And, in fact, what we find is that, when States and localities do infrastructure, they can do so more efficiently, far less expensively as a result of the Byzantine labyrinth of Federal regulations that you have to comply with as soon as you are doing any kind of a road project that involves even a single dollar of Federal funds. My amendment also requires a 5-year plan to pay off all of our highway trust fund's outstanding obligations.

And, on day one, my amendment reduces the fuel tax from 18.4 cents to 7 cents on gasoline and the diesel tax from 24.3 to 8.3 cents to keep pace with the current spending needs of the Interstate Highway System.

We also can't forget the burdensome Federal regulations and intervention that balloon the costs of our country's infrastructure projects. The Competitive Enterprise Institute has estimated that Federal regulations and intervention cost American consumers and businesses nearly \$2 trillion annually. We know that, within Federal infrastructure projects, there are a multitude of Federal regulations that drive up the cost of each project by as much

as 20 percent, in many cases more like 30 percent, and I am told, in some cases, even more than that.

Ultimately, we drive up infrastructure costs when we make the projects Federal. It doesn't need to be this way, because most of these are not Federal projects. That is why my amendment also addresses two key regulatory challenges in our infrastructure context.

One, it reforms the NEPA process to ensure projects are given certain timelines and not stalled out by frivolous lawsuits. It reforms NEPA so that our infrastructure money actually goes to NEPA rather than resulting in endless delays brought about by NEPA and NEPA-related litigation.

Two, it repeals the Davis-Bacon wage requirements that artificially increase the labor costs beyond what the market demands—labor costs that are especially important and hard felt right now given the labor shortage.

The Senate has a choice today. You can choose to pay less and build more. You can offer Americans a tax cut—a tax cut that will affect poor and middle-class Americans most acutely, most immediately, most directly—and it will also simultaneously provide long-term solvency to the highway trust fund and lower the costs of our Nation's infrastructure projects.

Or, alternatively, if you don't want to vote for this, you can choose our current path, which is to continue to saddle the American people with debt, more inflation, financial insolvency, and more inevitable taxes. You can also vote against it and choose to continue the current practice of allowing for endless, needless, pointless delays in our infrastructure projects that really harm Americans.

Look, at the end of the day, we just want more of our tax dollars going into funding steel and concrete to go into the ground so that America's moms and dads can spend less time stuck in gridlock traffic and more time with their families. The choice seems very clear to me.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this amendment to build more and pay less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I have great respect for my colleague from Utah, but I am in firm opposition to his amendment.

It would completely undo months of hard work, bipartisan hard work. The two major bipartisan infrastructure bills that Chairman CARPER and I and the EPW Committee passed unanimously would be totally undone here. The bipartisan gang spent months carefully and considerably negotiating this agreement with the White House. All of these meaningful investments

that I talked about yesterday would be gone: the new bridge program—gone; supplemental funding for the Appalachian Development Highway System—gone; broadband funding needed to help close the digital divide—gone.

We have come too far to throw all of this bipartisan work away on this substitute. Time is of the essence. Let's give our States the certainty that they need.

By the way, there is permitting reform in this bill, right here, as we look at it. Let's get this across the finish line. So I would urge my colleagues to vote no on this amendment.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I, too, rise in opposition to Senator LEE's amendment.

This amendment does not reform the Federal-aid highway system as we know it; it dismantles it. It eliminates the Federal funding that each of our States relies on to build, repair, and to maintain our Federal highways. It would strike the entire surface reauthorization in this bill before us and replace it with an interstate highway-only bill with top-line funding of less than \$20 billion over 5 years.

At a time when we already have some 45,000 structurally deficient bridges in our Nation, this amendment would leave American travelers at risk due to serious disinvestment.

Senators have come together, Democrats and Republicans, to bring this infrastructure bill to the floor because we recognize that States are in need of serious investment to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure.

This is not a partisan issue. On the Environment and Public Works Committee, where Senator CAPITO and I lead, we voted unanimously to advance a highway bill out of committee on a unanimous vote—20 to nothing. That bill increases the top-line funding for our highway Federal programs by 34 percent to a little over \$300 billion—the highest amount of highway funding ever authorized by this Congress—and it is much needed.

Senator LEE's amendment would go in the exact opposite direction, unfortunately. It would reduce the funding in our bill to less than \$20 billion. That is a cut of about 95 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

#### VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2255

The question is on agreeing to Lee amendment No. 2255.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and

the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 78, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 295 Leg.]

#### YEAS—20

Barrasso	Daines	Lee
Blackburn	Ernst	Lummis
Boozman	Grassley	Paul
Braun	Hagerty	Rubio
Cornyn	Johnson	Sasse
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Lankford	

#### NAYS—78

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Romney
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hoeven	Rounds
Blunt	Hyde-Smith	Sanders
Booker	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	Kelly	Schumer
Burr	King	Scott (SC)
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Capito	Leahy	Shelby
Cardin	Lujan	Sinema
Carper	Manchin	Smith
Casey	Markey	Stabenow
Cassidy	Marshall	Sullivan
Collins	McConnell	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Thune
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Tillis
Cramer	Moran	Toomey
Crapo	Murkowski	Tuberville
Duckworth	Murphy	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murray	Warner
Feinstein	Ossoff	Warnock
Fischer	Padilla	Warren
Gillibrand	Peters	Whitehouse
Hassan	Portman	Wicker
Hawley	Reed	Wyden
Heinrich	Risch	Young

#### NOT VOTING—2

Graham	Inhofe
--------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 20, the nays are 78. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for adoption of this amendment, the amendment is not agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2255) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

#### RECESS

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess until 2:15 p.m.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:12 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. LUJÁN).

#### INVESTING IN A NEW VISION FOR THE ENVIRONMENT AND SURFACE TRANSPORTATION IN AMERICA ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

#### WEALTH GAP

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, as a former mayor, I have a sense as to how important physical infrastructure—roads, bridges, water systems, wastewater plants—are, and I am delighted that we are finally beginning to address our long-neglected physical infrastructure. That is enormously important.

But I will tell you what is even more important, and that is to address the human infrastructure, the needs of the